DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 758 EA 002 837

AUTHOR	Lerner, Joseph S.; Rothstein, Jerome H.
TITLE	Special Education: PROJECT DESIGN. Educational Needs, Fresno, 1968, Number 19.
INSTITUTION	Fresno City Unified School District, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education.
PUB DATE	68
NOTE	25p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Fresno City Unified School District, Calif. 93707
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Crippled Children, Deaf Blind, Educable Mentally Handicapped, *Educational Needs, *Educational Planning, Enrollment Trends, *Handicapped Students, National Norms, *Program Evaluation, *Special Education, Speech Handicapped
IDENTIFIERS	ESEA Title 3 Programs, Fresno, Project Design

ABSTRACT

Educational needs in the special education program of the Fresno City Unified School District are evaluated as part of PROJECT DESIGN, funded under ESEA Title III. In the study, data collected in the school district were compared with national trends. The major conclusion is that the overall program compares favorably with national norms. More specifically, programs for the deaf and blind were rated excellent. However, programs for the partially sighted, hard of hearing, speech impaired, crippled, and educationally handicapped fell below the enrollment trends nationally. It is suggested that more thorough screening methods in these areas would raise enrollments closer to the national rates. Classroom quality is adequate in most cases, with the exception that classes for the educationally handicapped are on double session. An additional suggestion is that the staff become more involved in budget preparation and admission procedures. (LN)

EA 002 837

Best Copy Available

ED038758

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

19. SPECIAL EDUCATION

FRESNO, 1968

ED038758

FRESNO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Board of Education

Ann M. Leavenworth, Ph.D., president
William C. Meux, clerk
William Dienstein, Ph.D., member
H. M. Ginsburg, M.D., member
J. E. Young, M.D., member

Administrative Staff

Erwin A. Dann, superintendent
Reid W. Gromis, assistant superintendent - personnel
Robert S. Miner, assistant superintendent - instruction
Dr. Robert A. Webber, assistant superintendent - business
Robert A. Hansen, director - planning and research
Dr. M. Marty Santigian, director - information services and human relations

Project Staff

Dr. Edward E. Hawkins, project director
William P. Booth, coordinator of research and evaluation
Larry Matthews, research assistant
Dr. Louise R. Pierce, research assistant
Dr. Richard Sparks, editing consultant
Richard M. Mallory, editing
Alan E. Lubic, editing

The work presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a Grant from the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

F O R E W O R D

PROJECT DESIGN (Inter-Agency Planning for Urban Educational Needs) was organized as a two-year project to develop a comprehensive long-range master plan of education for the Fresno City Unified School District in California.

This project was conceived by school leadership to bring under one umbrella current major problems of the schools, the relationship of the schools to the broader community, the impact of educational change now occurring throughout the nation, and a fresh view of the educational needs, goals and aspirations of our youth and adults. The ultimate purpose of the project is to weld into an integrated plan the best use of available resources to meet the totality of current and projected needs according to their rational priorities.

The United States Office of Education funded the proposal as an exemplary Title III project, recognizing the urgency for developing better planning processes for urban school systems. The first year of this project was organized to assess current and projected educational needs in the urban area served by the Fresno City Schools. Planning procedures will be carried out in the second project year.

A major dimension of the Needs Assessment is an analysis of educational and urban factors by a Task Force of specialists. This report is one of the Task Force Needs Assessment publication series. See the next page for the complete list of project Needs Assessment publications.

PROJECT DESIGN

NEEDS ASSESSMENT PUBLICATIONS

1. Brainstorm - Needs Perceived by School Staff
2. Speak-Up - Needs Perceived by Community
3. Student Speak-Up - Needs Perceived by Secondary Students
4. School Staffing
5. Analysis of Achievement
6. Problems Perceived by Educational Leadership

County Schools Survey

7. Vocational Occupational Needs Survey (published by County Regional Planning and Evaluation Center - EDICT)
8. Other County School Needs Survey Reports (by EDICT)
9. Other County School Needs Survey Reports (by EDICT)

TASK FORCE

Educational Content Fields

10. Reading
11. Language
12. Mathematics
13. Science
14. Foreign Language
15. Cultural Arts
16. Social Science
17. Physical Education

Other Educational Areas

18. Teaching/Learning Process
19. Special Education
20. Guidance
21. Health
22. Student Personnel
23. Adult Education
24. Vocational Education

Urban Physical Factors

25. Urban Physical Factors

Urban Social and Human Factors

26. Relevance and Quality of Education for Minorities
27. Special Needs of Mexican-Americans
28. Special Needs of Negroes

29. Conclusions from Needs Assessment Publications
30. Summary - Fresno Educational Needs Assessment
31. The Process of Educational Planning

19. SPECIAL EDUCATION

JOSEPH S. LERNER - Ed.D., School Administration, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona

- Professor of Special Education, San Francisco State College

Offices Held:
- U. S. Army Air Force, Psychological Research Unit
- Director of Training, Arizona Children's Colony
- Director of Special Training Services, Kern County Superintendent of Schools Office
- Chairman of Department of Special Education, San Francisco State College
- Councilor, American Association on Mental Deficiency
- Regional Chairman, Region III, A.A.M.D.
- Chapter President, Council for Exceptional Children
- Contributing Editor, Journal for Exceptional Children
- Member Advisory Committee on Curriculum Guidelines for the Mentally Retarded State of California

Publication:
- "Recommended Techniques for In-Service Education of Teachers of Mentally Retarded Children in State Institutions", American Journal on Mental Deficiency, Nov.,1957.

- "Report of Special on-The-Job Training for Mentally Retarded Youth and Adults", Report of Special On-The-Job Training Demonstration Project for Mentally Retarded Youth and Adults. Children's Health Home for Mentally Retarded Children and Adults, Inc., San Mateo, California, Prepared in Cooperation with Jerome H. Rothstein and Eve Mocek, July,1965.

19. SPECIAL EDUCATION

JEROME H. ROTHSTEIN - Ed.D., Columbia University

- Professor of Special Education, San Francisco State College

Offices Held:
- National Vice-President, American Association on Mental Deficiency
- Associate Editor, Mental Retardation Journal
- Editor, California State CEC Journal
- Consulting Psychologist, Childrens Health Home of San Mateo
- Training Consultant, Mental Retardation Project, Agnews State Hospital
- Consultant, Office of Program Review, Department of Mental Hygiene
- Special Education Consultant, San Benito County

Publications:
- Mental Retardation: Readings and Resources, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961
- Children with Severe Learning Disorders, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, in galley.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Initial Charge	1
Experimental Design	1
Major Conclusions	2
Classification Matrix of Needs	4
Tables:	
I. Incidence of Handicapped Children	5
II. Levels of Professional Preparation	6
Summary of Enrollment Findings	7
Program Needs	9
Historical Detail	12
Methodology Detail	14
Major Conclusions Identified by Project Staff	15

INITIAL CHARGE

The initial charge as seen by the investigators is to assess the program of special education in the Fresno City Unified School District in order to evaluate the adequacy of the present program. This was attempted by determing the following data:

1. The numbers of children served and the percent of the district enrollment they represent
2. The areas of special education provided by the district
3. The level of preparation of the teaching and support personnel
4. The adequacy of housing provided the various programs
5. The curricula presently in use
6. The supervision provided for teachers
7. The overall program planning for handicapped youth in the community and the portion provided by the school district.

From comparison of these data with national trends and programs, conclusions will be drawn as to the needs of the District in the provision of special education services in the public schools of Fresno.

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

The gathering of data was accomplished by the following methods:

1. Perusal of many materials made available through Project Design and the Fresno City Unified School District, including curricula, directories, and statistical material on the socio-economic level of the community
2. Observation of selected special classes in each area
3. Interviewing of teachers, supervisors and administrative personnel
4. Summary conferences with administrative and supervisory staff in special education and guidance.

The first visit of the investigators took place on May 13 and 14, 1968, when classes were visited in the following schools:

1. Ericson School -- classes for the educationally handicapped

2. Sunshine School -- classes for the orthopedically handicapped

3. Birney School -- classes for the deaf

4. Mayfair School -- class for the blind

5. Scandinavian School -- classes for the educable mentally retarded.

In addition conferences were held with the Director and Assistant Director of Special Education Services, the Director of Guidance, Testing and Counseling Services and the Work Experience Teacher for the secondary educable mentally retarded. A visit to the Kelso Center was attempted but pupils had already left for the day.

One investigator returned for further visiting on June 10 and 11, 1968, to discuss programs at some length with the Director of Guidance, the Coordinator for Developmental Classes for the Educable Mentally Retarded and the Work Experience Teacher. In addition, he had interviews with the Director of Special Education Services, the Administrator of the Division of Special Services, the Assistant Superintendent of Business Services, and a parent respresenting the local chapter of the California Association for Neurologically Handicapped Children.

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

Both investigators were favorably impressed with the type of program being attempted in the Fresno City Unified School District. The growth problems of certain programs are reflected in need for more classrooms (educationally handicapped) to mount the program presently provided as well as to reflect programs on a larger scale after more careful screening can be accomplished. It is recognized that not every city population is typical and in fact, there may not be as many children with special needs as reflected in the national standards presented. It is suspected that with more adequate numbers of staff to diagnose and evaluate student needs and to teach classes, that incidence figures closer to national standards would result.

Classroom quality was seen as adequate and in most cases on a par with classroom facilities for normal children, the exception being the classes for the educationally handicapped on double session. The influence of the Field Act requiring the replacement of many classroom units will undoubtedly affect expansion of all programs including special education, unless it becomes of greater concern to provide the best possible program, instead of providing a less painful transition. This concept revolves around the dilemma of whether we provide the program we can buy with the money allowed us, or plan the best possible program and then set out to obtain the needed funds to provide it.

An opportunity for more involvement by supervisory and teaching personnel in budget preparation is being overlooked. Knowledge of sources and amounts of funds available to them can encourage a feeling of concern for their effective use, and stimulate interest in keeping abreast of new developments in instructional media and materials.

The practice of involving teachers in the admissions committee procedures when staffing children for placement is recognized as desirable professionally. This should be universally practiced. At the present time teachers likely to be involved are part of the admissions committee when physically handicapped children are considered. This is not the common practice when educable mentally retarded and educationally handicapped children are staffed. Records regarding the child being placed should be available to the supervisory staff and receiving teachers prior to placement. This is not always done prior to placement with the educable mentally retarded.

Conferences with administrative and supervisory personnel indicate their awareness of the needs these comments reflect. Plans for revision of curriculum guides for the educable mentally retarded, provision of learning disability groups in student's home schools, reassessment of students in the educable mentally retarded program and additional expansion of classes in this area, and increased staff in support personnel are being considered.

CLASSIFICATION MATRIX OF NEEDS

I. SOCIETAL STANDARDS	II. ASSESSMENT DATA	III. LEARNING NEEDS
1. Children should be educated to get along with fellowmen... social competence through social experiences.	1. What program goals have been attained?	1. Nature of learner and Nature of Society in which he lives must be effective basis for social development.
2. Develop occupational competence through efficient guidance and work experience.	2. Are expectations appropriate and attainable?	2. Persistent life demands for occupational adjustment and employment.
3. Develop emotional security and independence.	3. Have personality traits been developed to free pupil of gross distortions and mental abnormalities?	3. Educational experiences that will provide for effective personal-social interaction.
4. Develop health habits.	4. Have pupils developed strong neuromotor skills and proficiency in health.	4. Sequential instruction and supervision of experiences at all levels.
5. Learn minimum essentials of tool subjects, even where academically limited.	5. Is there a positive correlation between curriculum provided by school and actual demands placed on pupils by society and world of work?	5. Educational experiences for achievement in (1) world of knowledge; (2) occupational life; (3) special relations and (4) worthy use of leisure time.
6. Develop wholesome use of leisure time.	6. Does program pick up pupil where he is and with what skills he has and move him in stated directions?	6. Development of ability to plan and choose leisure activities.

CLASSIFICATION MATRIX OF NEEDS

I. SOCIETAL STANDARDS	II. ASSESSMENT DATA	III. LEARNING NEEDS
7. Learn to become adequate members of family & home .	7. Does program aid pupils to become contributing member of home?	7. Developing concept of home-family living through dynamic experiences•
8. Learn to become adequate members of community•	8. Do pupils learn to become adequate members of community through a school program that emphasizes community participation?	8. Concepts of effective consumer, utilizer of community services and role of citizen in community.
References: Rothstein, J.H., Mental Retardation, Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1961	References: Programs for the Mentally Retarded in California, State Department of Education, 1967 (Educable)	

CLASSIFICATION MATRIX OF NEEDS

IV. TEACHERS IN CLASSROOMS	V. ADMINISTRATION IN SCHOOLS	VI. MANAGERS OF DISTRICT OPERATIONS	VII. PARENTS IN HOME	VII. LEADERS IN THE COMMUNITY
1. All Special Ed. teachers must understand need for continuum of services.	1. Emphasize maximum integration of special class pupils and special education teachers.	1. Initiate in-service training program.	1. Be involved and supportive of program.	1. Provide necessary positive public relations.
2. Occupational Education and Work Training habits begin at primary level.	2. Provide space, facilities and support for uniqueness of program.	2. Encourage bold innovations in programming.	2. Be proud of efforts to meet realistic needs of pupils.	2. Sell community of need for program.
3. Teachers must apply sound mental health principles in learning situations.	3. Provide diagnostic services and mental health care when needed.	3. Be supportive of program.	3. Participate as a volunteer and aids when needed.	3. Be willing to share in costs.
4. Teachers inculcate sound principles of healthful life.	4. Advise parents of special health needs that require correction.	4. Recognize need for program and be able to make changes where indicated.	4. Help other parents to accept reality of having a handicapped child.	4. Be ready to meet new and unique situations boldly.
5. Teaching of skill in terms of "survival knowledge.	5. Assist in development of adequate and realistic curriculum.	5. Recognize need for program.	5. Accept limitations of child.	5. Recognize need for pre and post school program.

CLASSIFICATION MATRIX OF NEEDS

IV. TEACHERS IN CLASSROOMS	V. ADMINISTRATION IN SCHOOLS	VI. MANAGERS OF DISTRICT OPERATIONS	VII. PARENTS IN HOME	VII. LEADERS IN THE COMMUNITY
6. Development of recreational skills for adults and teenage living needs.	6. Provide for utilization of school facilities for leisure time activities.	6. Be aware of new and emerging trends in state and federal legislation.	6. Provide out of school opportunies.	6. Understand the role of total rehabilitation.
7. Development of skills to understand the significance of the family structure.	7. Encourage parent organizations.		7. Be active---not passive in parent groups.	
8. Development of understanding of rights and duties of citizens in democratic society.	8. Provide services for pupils to explore the community.			

TABLE I INCIDENCE OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND RELATED DATA

	Fresno City Unified School District (1967-8 Data)				(1966-7	California Maximum		National Estimate	
Area of Special Ed.	Incid-ence	No. of Tchrs.	Tchr.-Pup. Ratio	% of Enrol.	Per Capita Costs	3-9 Yrs Maximum Enrol. per class	10-20 Yr Maximum Enrol. per class	Tchr-Pup Ratio	% total Enrol.
Blind	20	3	1:7	.03	$ 1958	8	10	1:10	.02
Partially Sighted	10	1	1:10	.017	4242	10	12	1:18	.20
Deaf	44	6	1:7	.07	1744	6	8	1:10	.07
Hard-of-Hearing	Included in program for the deaf					8	10	1:35	.50
Speech Impaired *	1139	13	1:90	2.0	2649	90	90	1:100	3.50
Crippled (OH and CP)	59	5	1:12	.10	2282	12	16	1:15	1.00
Phys.Hand in Day Cl.	10	--	----	.016	800	--	--	----	---
Special Health Prob. **	--	13	----	----	568	--	20	1:20	1.00
Educationally Hand. (Soc.and Emot.Dist) ***	43	5	1:8	.07	1895	8	10-12	1:20	2.00
Gifted	--	--	----	----	----	--	--	1:25	2.00
Mentally Retarded (Educable) ****	608	42	1:14	1.00	1064	15-18	15-18	1:15	2.30

1. Maximum possible for speech therapists limited to case load of 90 per week by Calif. Code.
* Aphasics Not included in Fresno program for speech impaired -- suspected cases in deaf program.
** Home and Hospital Instruction
*** National figures do not represent educationally handicapped. Fresno and Calif. figures do.
****Educable Mentally Retarded only. Trainable Mentally Retarded provided for in County Operated Classes at Kelso Center.

TABLE II -
LEVELS OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL

Area	Full Credential	Partial Credential	Provisional
Visually Handicapped	4		
Deaf and Hard-of-Hear.	6		
Speech and Hearing	12	1	
Orthopedically Hand.	5		
Home Instruction	13		
Educationally Hand.	5		
Edueable Ment. Ret.	24	8	10

Psychologists all hold the M.A. degree and one Ed. D. degree.

SUMMARY OF ENROLLMENT FINDINGS

The findings of the investigation are presented in tabular form on page 5 and present data on the Fresno City Unified School District, the maximum allowable classroom enrollment limits in California, and the teacher-pupil ratio and percent of total enrollment based on expected incidence accepted nationally. From these data we can derive the following information for each area of handicap:

1. Blind - Program compares favorably with national standards.

2. Partially Sighted - Program is very limited in number served by national standards. Approximately .2% of the school population or 114 children in Fresno should be in a sight-saving program. Either there is a peculiarly low incidence in Fresno, or more careful screening to discover where the partially sighted are in regular classrooms should be considered.

3. Deaf - Program seems adequate for the deaf.

4. Hard-of-Hearing - Program is with the deaf and if they number more than five or ten, the program for the deaf is below national standards of incidence. The incidence of hard-of-hearing children is approximately .5% of the school population or 285 children. In addition, there is no program specifically for aphasic children through some of the children in the program for the deaf seem to be aphasic. More careful screening as for partially sighted would be in order.

5. Speech Impaired - Program limited to load of 90 children per therapist. Allowing for one therapist for the Sunshine School program (59 orthopedically handicapped students) and one for the EMR classes to a maximum of 90 students the present potential for the 13 therapists is reaching only 2% of the student population. National figures show that 3.5% should be served.

6. Crippled - (Orthopedically Handicapped and Cerebral Palsied) - Program including approximately 10 pupils who are physcially handicapped in regular day classes accounts for less than .2% of the school enrollment. National standards indicate that 1% of the school population would be the expected incidence.

7. Special Health Problems - Home and hospital instruction program occupies a total of twelve full-time teachers. Incidence figures were not available, but by national standards should be approximately 570 students per year.

8. Educationally Handicapped - Program includes neurologically handicapped and emotionally disturbed children. Number enrolled is considerably lower than the state limit of 2%. National figures were not available for comparison. Various authorities suggest incidence up to and above 10% of the school population. National figures include the social deviate not included in the term educationally handicapped as used in California. Program seems inadequate from point of numbers being served and conditions in the classroom. Four classes at Ericson school are on double session. Space and personnel needs are obvious.

9. Gifted - Program not under supervision of special education director, involves enrichment program at 5th and 6th grade ad and summer program for 2nd and 5th graders preparing for possible acceleration of one grade. This program is under the supervision of the curriculum division. By national standards 2% or approximately 1140 children should be enrolled or provided with special programs.

10. Educable Mentally Retarded - Program serves approximately 1% of school population while 2.3% is national incidence figure. Teacher ratio and class loads within desired limits but program is obviously not reaching all children who need it.

11. Trainable Mentally Retarded - Program provided by Fresno County Schools Office. Figures on incidence not available due to limited time the investigators could devote. Classrooms were seen on visit to Kelso Center. Incidence figures for Fresno City Unified School District should be about .2% or about 114 children.

The levels of professional preparation of the teachers, psychologists and speech and hearing personnel are presented in Table II. With the exception of the educable mentally retarded the levels of professional preparation are very good. Suggestions as to how to upgrade the program in this area are reflected in the program needs on page 10 (Teacher personnel.)

PROGRAM NEEDS:

Clinic Services:

1. Development of permanent local clinic center for diagnostic, evaluative, guidance and fixed-point-of-referral center

2. A research center.

Pre-School Program:

1. Head Start Program for young M.R. children CA: 3-6

2. Child development center for young handicapped children Perhaps, with partial public-state suppport and/or federal aid

3. Pre-School services to emphasize Language Development, Neuro-Motor Training and Social Maturity Skills

4. Pre-School Program as an Adult Education Center for Parents of Retarded Children

5. Pre-School Program as laboratory facility for Fresno State College students.

Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center

1. Joint effort between Fresno State College and local school system to establish centrally located curriculum and instructional materials library.

Elementary Educable Program:

1. Need to define specific program goals

2. Need for revision of curriculum guide to reflect realistic life needs of students rather than present academic orientation

3. Programs to start with children younger than 8 year olds - provide a continuing program for children leaving pre-school programs.

Secondary Educable Program:

1. Need for revision of curriculum guide to reflect realistic life needs of students rather than present academic orientation

2. Greater emphasis on occupational education

3. Additional personnel as "job finders" and supervisors of work experience

4. Continued use of cooperative job placement services with State.

Program for Trainable Mentally Retarded:

1. Develop techniques to overcome isolation of pupils--this is a critical matter if any degree of independence is to be developed

2. Week-end and evening recreation program for teen-age trainable retarded

3. Development of outdoor education and camping program

4. Close liaison with local community sheltered workshop.

Educationally Handicapped Program:

1. Development of Learning Disability groups as resource centers

2. More school-wide awareness of E.H. program to provide better acceptance and assumption of responsibility by all teachers

3. Integration of activities with other children where possible.

Overall Philosophy of Special Education:

1. Develop a statement of the overall osophy of special education.

Teacher Personnel:

1. Meet teacher needs for continuing education services in conjunction with Fresno State College, specialized consultants, and attendance and participation in professional organizations

2. Establishment of Curriculum Committee to revise current curriculum guides in all appropriate areas to meet realistic personal, social and vocational goals of students

3. More direct supervisory services including demonstration teaching by supervisory staff

4. Injection of current methodology in teaching program to include clinical and prescriptive teaching approaches.

Parent Education:

1. Need to establish parent education groups for educable retarded and other handicapped groups not presently organized, and encourage presently organized groups

2. Utilize public relations role of parent groups to sell program to community

3. Utilize parent ideas in program development.

Community Services:

1. Need for coordination of services to provide adequate community-wide activities in recreation etc. for handicapped youth and for the "after school-what" period in their lives.

HISTORICAL DETAIL

The program for the Educable Mentally Retarded was made mandatory in California in 1947. Since that time, there has been phenomenal growth in enrollments. Vast changes have taken place in this 20 year period of time. These include extension of the program through the secondary school years and the development of pre-school programs for young retardates. Occupational as well as developmental centers have augmented the overall program. Refinements in diagnostic procedures have been developed and curriculum standards are now in the process of development. Teacher education institutions are now coming close to meeting the needs for personnel both in the classroom and in leadership positions. With all of this growth, not more than 50% of the children requiring special education services are now getting this type of help.

Various public school programs for the physically handicapped have grown to the point where the state residential schools serve only outlying geographic areas or the more multiply-handicapped. Where physical handicaps are obvious and more readily recognized, programs are better meeting the needs of children.

In addition, districts and counties have established programs for the Trainable Mentally Retarded and more recently, programs for the Educationally Handicapped including the Emotionally Disturbed and the Neurologically Impaired. All of these unique programs have made it possible to utilize the differential diagnostic process to more clearly delineate children with learning disorders and to appropriately place them in the facility that best meets their needs.

Reference is made to sections 6900 et seq. and appropriate sections of the Administrative Code, Title 5 for further details on legal structure.

Federal involvement in the extension and improvement of services for the educable metnally retarded has increased at a very rapid pace during the last ten years. Of great importance are the following enactments:

P.L. 89-10, Title One (Educational opportunities for children coming from low-income families)

P.L. 85-926, Section 302 (A) (Research and Demonstration Projects in Education of the Handicapped)

P.L. 85-905 (Instructional Media for the Handicapped)

P.L. 88-164 (Amends P.L. 85-926 and extends act)

P.L. 90-247, Title Six (Extension of programs for the Handicapped (ESEA Act)

It is recognized and accepted that the several states and their local administrative sub-divisions cannot provide maximum services to the mentally retarded without some form of federal assistance. Hence, the aforementioned federal enactments will provide for; (1) Special education services for nine million children not now receiving them; (2) Bring help to the neediest group...the impoverished, both educationally and materially; (3) Authorize services for bi-lingual, Indian and other culturally handicapped youngsters; (4) Provide for supplementary educational centers and library services and (5) The establishment of regional educational laboratories to extend the knowledge of the problems relating to the teaching and learning process.

METHODOLOGY DETAIL

Statistical data for the Fresno City Unified School District presented in Table I were obtained from Mr. Vernon L. Heckman, Director, Department of Special Education Services and Dr. Robert A. Webber, Assistant Superintendent, Division of Business Services. Data for standards of special day class size for State of California were obtained from the Special Education Newsletter of the Division of Special Schools and Services, Sacramento, March 1968. Data for national standards of incidence were obtained from Connor, Leo, Administration of Special Education Programs, Teachers College Press, 1961, page 4a.

Data on preparation of teachers was obtained from Mr. Vernon Heckman, and on psychologists from Margaret L. Thomas, Director, Department of Guidance, Testing and Counseling Services.

TF 19. SPECIAL EDUCATION

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS IDENTIFIED BY PROJECT STAFF

TF 19- 1. Low enrollment in special education programs in comparison to average enrollments nationally may indicate the program is not reaching all the students for which it is intended.

TF 19- 2. Develop a program for the aphasic child.

TF 19- 3. More space, principally classroom needs for the educationally handicapped program should be supplied.

TF 19- 4. There should be involvement of total special education personnel in determining budget needs.

TF 19- 5. Involvement of special education personnel in student placement committees is needed.

TF 19- 6. A permanent local clinic center for diagnostic, evaluative, guidance, and fixed point referrals is needed.

TF 19- 7. The district should develop a statement of the overall philosophy of special education.

TF 19- 8. Parents should be involved in the development of special education programs.

TF 19- 9. There should be more school-wide awareness of the Educationally Handicapped Program to provide acceptance and involvement with all teachers and integration of student activities where possible.